

REMARKS

Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define the claimed invention. More particularly, claims 1-3 have been amended to incorporate the limitation of previous dependent claim 4, and claim 1 is further amended to clarify the method takes place *in vivo*. Claims 4, 8, 10 and 16 have been canceled. Applicants acknowledge that these amendments are being made after final rejection, and that entry of amendments after final are made at the Examiner's discretion. However, the amendments to the claims are believed to be responsive to the Examiner's most recent rejections in the present Office Action, and applicants believe the amendments fully address the Examiner's objection without raising any new issues and place the claims in condition for allowance, or in better form for appeal. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and consideration of the following remarks.

Applicants acknowledge that all rejections issued in the previous Office Action have been withdrawn and that the requested amended title has been entered into the record. Applicants address the new rejections issued in the final Office Action as follows.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. In particular the Examiner has objected to the usage of the term "co-culturing" when only one cell type is specifically mentioned in the claim. Applicants have amended claim 3 to specifically recite the presence of a second cell type (a dendritic cell) consistent with the original claim language implying the presence of a second cell, and consistent with previously dependent claim 4 (now canceled). The amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the Examiner's rejection and applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under that statutory section.

Claims 1-4, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. The Examiner states that the specification is enabling for a method of inducing proliferation of neural stem cell/neural precursor cells in the presence of GM-CSF and dendritic cells. However, the Examiner notes that claims 1-4, 8 and 10 are not limited to such embodiments and that the specification fails to enable the full scope of the claimed invention. In particular the Examiner contends that GM-CSF cannot stimulate the proliferation of neural stem cell/neural precursor cells when it is used as the sole agent or when it is administered distally. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However to advance the prosecution of the present application, applicants have amended claim 1 to specifically recite that the method is conducted *in vivo* and thus the administered GM-CSF will contact nervous tissue that comprises both dendritic cells and neural stem cell/neural precursor cells.

Applicants believe the amendment to claim 1 simply clarifies the previous language of claim 1. Claim 1 previously stated that endogenous neural stem cell/neural precursors were contacted with GM-CSF. Thus the method was intended to be directed to an *in vivo* application. Since the method relates to the *in vivo* administration of GM-CSF, all cells present in nervous tissue (e.g., dendritic cells as well as neural stem cell/neural precursors) would come in contact with GM-CSF. Accordingly, to clarify the original meaning of the claim, claim 1 is amended to recite that the method takes place *in vivo* and that both neural stem cell/neural precursor cells and dendritic cells are contacted with GM-CSF.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended similarly to expressly recite that neural stem cell/neural precursors and dendritic cells are present together and contacted with GM-CSF. As noted by the Examiner applicants have enabled a method for inducing proliferation of neural stem cell/neural precursor cells in the presence of GM-CSF and an additional cell type (e.g., a dendritic cell). Claims 4, 8, and 10 have been canceled rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Accordingly applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However to advance the prosecution of the present application, claim 16 has been canceled rendering the rejection moot.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,946,548. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However to advance the prosecution of the present application, claims 8 and 10 have been canceled rendering the rejection moot.

The foregoing amendments and remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the rejections raised by the Examiner in the final Office Action. Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request passage of the application to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP



John P. Breen
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,833

Indianapolis, IN
(317) 231-7401